



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,955	04/14/2004	Ming-Chun Chou	N1161-00026	5433

8933 7590 02/12/2008  
DUANE MORRIS, LLP  
IP DEPARTMENT  
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196

EXAMINER
----------

KARLS, SHAY LYNN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3723

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/12/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1-3, 10-13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a/e) as being anticipated by Oikawa et al. (USPN 6651287).**

Oikawa teaches a device comprising a calibration unit (Wf, figure 17) of a thickness substantially identical to that of a wafer to be cleaned. There is at least one light source (27a) positioned to generate at least one light beam across a surface of the calibration unit in a plane substantially corresponding to the surface of the calibration unit. There is further a light detector (27b) for detecting the light beam. When a brush (21) contacts a plane, the light beam is interrupted by the brush.

With regards to claim 2, the light detector generates a first indication if the light beam is not interrupted and a second indication if the light beam is interrupted by the brush (see flow chart in figure 6).

With regards to claim 3, there is a processor for processing the first and second indications (col. 5, lines 5-26).

Art Unit: 3723

With regards to claim 10, the light source and the light detector are on the surface of the calibration unit (figure 17). They are disposed on the upper portion of the calibration unit. The claim fails to state that the light source and detector are directly location on the calibration unit.

With regards to claim 11, Oikawa teaches a wafer cleaning system comprising a wafer rotating mechanism (10), a brush (21), a calibration unit (Wf; figure 17) of a thickness substantially identical to that of a wafer to be cleaned and a light source (27a) positioned to generate at least one light beam across a surface of the calibration unit in a plane substantially corresponding to the surface of the calibration unit. There is further a light detector (27b) for detecting the light beam. When the brush (21) contacts the plane, the light beam is interrupted by the brush.

With regards to claim 12, the light detector generates a first indication if the light beam is not interrupted and a second indication if the light beam is interrupted by the brush (see flow chart in figure 6).

With regards to claim 13, there is a processor for processing the first and second indications (col. 5, lines 5-26).

With regards to claim 20, the light source and the light detector are on the surface of the calibration unit (figure 17). They are disposed on the upper portion of the calibration unit. The claim fails to state that the light source and detector are directly location on the calibration unit.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3723

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claims 4-5 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oikawa ('287).**

Oikawa teaches all the essential elements of the claimed invention however fails to teach that when the brush interrupts the light beam, the brush stops. Oikawa teaches the opposite wherein when the brush interrupts the light, the brush moves. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the controller so that rather than having the interrupted laser beam be indicative of the brush moving, the interrupted laser beam would indicate that the brush needs to stop. Reversal of parts is a modification that has been considered to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Gazda*, 104 USPQ 400, 402. MPEP 2144.

**Claims 6-7 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oikawa ('287).**

Oikawa teaches all the essential elements of the claimed invention however fails to teach manually stopping the brush when the brush interrupts the light beam. Oikawa teaches automatically controlling the movement of the brush. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3723

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the controller so the brush needs to be manually stopped when interrupting the beam. Modifying manual parts to make them automatic and modifying automatic parts to making parts manual are both modifications that have been considered to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Venner*. 120 USPQ 192, 194. MPEP 2144.

**Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oikawa ('287).**

Oikawa teaches all the essential elements of the claimed invention however fails to teach an indicator light for when the light beam is interrupted by the brush. Oikawa instead teaches an alarm when the brush does not interrupt the light beam. As stated above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the controller so that rather than having the interrupted laser beam be indicative of the brush moving, the interrupted laser beam would indicate that the brush needs to stop. This in turn would then mean that the alarm would be activated when the brush interrupted the beam. Reversal of parts is a modification that has been considered to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Gazda*. 104 USPQ 400, 402. MPEP 2144. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the alarm with an indicator light since alarms and indicator lights are both well known in the art as a means for providing a signal. Additionally, the claim would have been obvious because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill the in art at the time of the invention.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, filed 1/27/07, with respect to Kim ('134) and Kasashima ('765) have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of Kim and Kasashima have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 and 11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicant amends the claims to include the new limitation that the calibration unit has a thickness substantially identical to that of a wafer to be cleaned and that the light source generates a light beam across a surface of the calibration unit. The applicant argues that Oikawa fails to teach a calibration unit that substantially identical in thickness to that of a wafer. Upon further consideration, the calibration unit of Oikawa is reference number Wf. While Oikawa teaches that Wf is a substrate, it is clear that since the applicant fails to provide any limitations which would distinguish the substrate from the calibration unit, the substrate reads on the claimed calibration unit.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 3723

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shay L. Karls whose telephone number is 571-272-1268. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-4:30 M-Th, alternating F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571-272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Shay L Karls/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3723



Application/Control Number: 10/823,955  
Art Unit: 3723

Page 8